Irregularities occurred in the National Project on Biogas Development

699. SHRI RAOOF VALIULLAH: SHRI D. B. CHANDRA GOWDA:

Will the Minister of ENERGY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that gross irregularities have occurred in various States in the National Project on Bio-gas Development (NPBD);

(b) what was the amount released by the Centre for the Project and what was the amount utilised by each State so far;

(c) in which States such irregularities have been detected and what are the details therof; and

(d)what action is contemplated by Government in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY (SHRI VASANT SATHE): (a) to (d) In the Review on National Project on Biogas Development conducted by Comptroller and Auditor General for the Period 1981-82 to 1984-85, certain shortcomings and irregularities have been mentioned in respect of certain States. Some of theise however relate to the period 1974-75 to 1980-81. The review covered the States of Andhra Pradsh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Kar-nataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Oristsa, Punjab, Raj'as-than, Tavnilnadu, Uttar Pradsh, West Bengal, TJhion Territories of Pondi-cherry and Goa, Daman and Diu and Khadi and Village Industries Commission (KVIC) and *inter-a.Ua* included points regarding misreporting of achievement, non-availability of completion certificates, defective and incomplete plants, financial outlays, monitoring and evaluation, etc. These shortcomings however relate to a small percentage or the total number of plants built mostly in the period when the programme was at its initial stages of implementation. Many of them have since been reconciled or corrected. Subsidies are in any case adjusted only in respect of plants duly certified by the State Governments to have been completed Statement indicates the total amount of subsidy, released during the period 1981-82 to 1984-85 and the total amount for which subsidy claims have been received by Government of India as on 30th June, 1986 from the concerned States/Union Territories KVIC. *(See* below).

The report of Comptroller and Auditor General has been examined in detail in consultation with the concerned State Governments, U.T. Administrations and KVIC and apart from the corrective action already taken, it has been ascertained that completion certificates in all cases are available with the States now. The position with regard to all other items has also improved significantly during 1984-85 and 1985-86. A number of steps were taken, such as increased number of training courses, arrangements for post-installation servicing of plants through provision of repair and maintenance kits, revival of defective plants, involvement of National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD) to monitor pendency of loan applications, evaluation studies by independent agencies, inspection reports for the field staff of State Governments and implementing agencies, etc. As a result of all these, the programme made marked progress in the last two years.

Statement

(Rs. in lakhs)

	State/U.T./Agency	Total amount of subsidy released during 1981-82 to 1984-85	Total amount for which subsidy claims have been received by Govt. of India as on 30ty June, 1986
1	Andhra Pradesh	694.00	616·99
2	Assam	16·96	20·68
3	Bihar	141·52	52·14
4	Gujarat	328·24	364·29
5	Haryana	175·37	211·64
6	Himachal Pradesh	101·73	109·01
7	Karnataka	363·80	264·96
8	Kerala	39·63	73·55
9	Madhya Pradesh	289·33	286·70
10	Maharashtra	1891·20	2108·89
11	Orissa	83·60	102·56
12	Punjab	72·50	111·83
13	Rajasthan	323·60	372·29
14	Tamilnadu	487·14	565·20
15	Uttar Pradesh	957·96	1397·21
16	West Bengal	130·28	139·24
17	Pondicherry	4·17	4·57
18	Goa, Daman & Diu	10·04	7·54
19	Khadi and Village Industries Commission, Bombay	1268·96	1377·36

Mangalore Refinery

700. SHRl D. B. CHANDRA GOWDA: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS be pleased to state;

(a) whether the Mangalore refinery is likely to be commissioned in the near future;

(b) if so, whether it is a fact that the Project Investment Board hab not given its clearance for the Mangalore Refinery; and

(c) if so, what are th$_e$ reasons therefor and by when final clearance will be given?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POWER AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI): (a) to (c) A refinery at Mangalore is proposed to b$_e$ taken up during the Seventh Plan in the joint sector. The matter is still under th$_e$ consideration of the Govt, including the Public Investment Board.